

REMARKS

In light of the above amendments and remarks to follow, reconsideration and allowance of this application is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner stated that Figures 12 and 13 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art--. Applicants submit herewith, a replacement sheet for Figures 12 and 13, which are now labeled "Prior Art". Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3 and 10-12 are in this application.

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Claim 1 has been amended herein and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3 and 10-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Reininger et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,426,463).

Independent claim 1 recites in part as follows:

"A device for controlling image encoding for use in a system provided with a plurality of encoding means for encoding a **plurality of program data**... and multiplexing means for multiplexing output data of each of the encoding means..."
(Underlining and bold added for emphasis.)

In explaining the above 102 rejection, the Examiner stated that Reininger "discloses the same device and method for controlling image encoding for use in a system with a plurality of encoding means (12-19) for encoding a plurality of program data 10 ... and multiplexing means 22 for multiplexing output data of each of the encoding means 15." It is respectfully submitted that Reininger does not disclose a system with a plurality of encoding means for encoding a plurality of program data and a multiplexing means for multiplexing the

output data of the encoding means. That is, Reininger discloses an encoder for encoding a single stream of video data (program data). The Y, C_r, and C_b components of the single stream of video data are encoded and multiplexed together. Reininger does not disclose encoding a plurality of program data and multiplexing the plurality of encoded program data.

Accordingly, claim 1 is believed to be distinguishable from Reininger. For reasons similar to those described above with regard to claim 1, claim 10 is believed to be distinguishable from Reininger. Claims 2, 3, 11, and 12, depend from one of claims 1 and 10, and, due to such dependency, are believed to be distinguishable from Reininger. Therefore, withdrawal of the above 102 rejection is respectfully requested.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to explain why claims 1-3 and 10-12 are in condition for allowance, and notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner is unable to issue a Notice of Allowance regarding these claims, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney in order to discuss any further outstanding issues.

Early and favorable consideration are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By: 

Gordon Kessler
Reg. No. 38,511
(212) 588-0800